

## REMARKS

Claims 1-13 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated February 2, 2004, claims 1-13 were rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 9. Applicant now requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-13.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application. Claims 1-13 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Khan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,575) ("Khan"). Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 9 and respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to claims 1-13 as amended.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6 and 9 to further define the claimed invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended as indicated above, and now specifies "a fourth set of instructions to direct a portable computing device to transform said search result in accordance with formatting information to produce formatted content." Claim 6 has been amended as indicated above, and now specifies a remote application server including "a content generator module internal to said portable computing device and configured to generate content in accordance with said search result and in accordance with said formatting information." Similarly, in claim 9, the step of transforming said search result now clarifies "transforming said search result by said portable computing device in accordance with said formatting information to produce formatted content." These amendments clarify that it is the *portable computing device* in this invention that transforms the search result in accordance with the formatting information to produce formatted content.

Khan does not teach or suggest transforming by the portable computing device of the search result in accordance with formatting information. In some embodiments, Kahn uses a "customizable information retrieval engine" (also called a "web-based habitat") to aggregate content of a user's choice and a "wireless enabling engine" to render the content on a wireless

device. (Col. 9 ln. 66 – Col. 10 ln. 26.) Khan “[a]ggregat[es] the retrieved content at a network server located remotely from the user,” and “format[s] the aggregated content at the network server for display on the wireless device”, and then “transmit[s] the formatted content to a wireless device for display on the wireless device.” (Fig. 2, see also col. 2, ln. 10-17, 27-28.) Hence, in Khan, the transformation of the search result using formatting information occurs at the network server located remotely from the user, not at the wireless device.

In contrast, the claimed invention transforms the search result in accordance with formatting information *at the portable computing device*. This is particularly advantageous because it allows the user to format content for display on the portable computing device without needing to perform this operation prior to transmitting the search results to the portable computing device. The claimed approach is beneficial because it allows the user to create new formatted pages dynamically, rather than having them previously prepared and stored. (Applicant’s Specification 56:18-23) Thus, this approach provides quicker retrieval and presentation of formatted content as well as less data to transmit wirelessly to the portable computing device over a limited bandwidth connection.

Kahn teaches the formatting of the aggregated content in the web-based habitat for display on the wireless device at the network server before transmission. (Col. 10 ln. 13-19). Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed invention by Kahn. Therefore, claims 1, 6 and 9 (all as amended), are believed to be patentable over Kahn for the reasons noted above, as well as for other patentable distinctions they particularly recite.

Moreover, it was not obvious at the time of invention to transform search results to produce formatted content at the portable computing device instead of the network server. The primary teaching of Kahn is the lightweight and portable nature of the wireless device. Kahn states that the main memory of the wireless device need not be of significant size because the application programs are executed on the host computer, and in the preferred embodiment the operation of the wireless device is limited to the terminal display of graphic

and related data. (Col. 13, ln. 29) Kahn teaches the reduction in the size of the main memory needed in the wireless device, (Col. 13, ln. 29-39) and this teaching is inconsistent with moving the function of transforming the search results to produce formatted content to the portable computing device. Thus, because Kahn teaches away from having the portable computing device perform the content formatting for display, the invention in claims 1, 6 and 9 was not obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-13 depend from patentable independent claims as well as recite additional patentable features not disclosed or suggested by Kahn. Claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-13 are patentable at least for the reason of their dependence from patentable independent claims, but also because of the patentable distinctions they particularly recite. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-13 are patentable over Kahn.

In view of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims presently in this case are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt favorable action are therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Saul Kato

By: 

Greg T. Sueoka, Esq.  
Registration No. 33,800  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7194  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200

23203/06768/DOCS/1433352.1